



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT CASES.

BANK CHECK—DEPOSIT FOR COLLECTION—CORRESPONDENT BANK—DEPOSITOR'S AGENT—*WILSON v. CARLINVILLE NATIONAL BANK*, 58 N. E. 250 (Ill).—A customer deposits with his bank a check for collection. The depository transmits the check for collection to its correspondent bank, using reasonable care in selecting such correspondent bank. *Held*, the correspondent bank becomes the agent of the depositor for such collection, and the depository is not liable to the depositor for any negligence on the part of the correspondent bank.

The authorities on this point, namely, whether the correspondent bank is agent for the depository bank or the depositor, are in direct conflict. The sounder rule seems to be that it is agent for the depository bank. This is the rule in England, United States Courts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, New York, and Ohio. But the following States hold that the correspondent bank is agent of the depositor: Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Tennessee, Wisconsin. See 3 *Am. & Eng. Ency. Law*, 810.

CARRIERS—LIABILITY FOR APPROPRIATION OF GOODS—CONTRIBUTION—*LEIFERT ET AL v. GALVESTON L. & H. RY. Co.*, 57 S. W. 899 (Tex).—Goods were wrongfully delivered by a connecting carrier to a steamship company instead of to the owner, and were carried to another place. The said company, having had notice of the ownership, claimed a lien for freight and sold the goods. *Held*, liable for conversion.

Counsel for defendant insisted that there could be no liability, as the law required the company, as a common carrier, to receive and transport goods tendered by connecting lines; however, the company was held liable on the ground that a carrier has no lien when the property is received from a wrongful holder, or from one not authorized to ship. 5 *Am. & Eng. Ency.* 403. *Sal-tus v. Everett*, 20 Wend. 275. This case is distinguishable from *Price v. Railroad Co.*, 21 Pac. 188, and *Patten v. Railroad Co.*, 29 Fed. 590, as the carrier had no authority, either as a general or a special agent, to ship the goods beyond the destination named in the bill of lading. As they were joint feasons, the steamship company is not entitled to contribution from the connecting carrier.

CARRIERS OF PASSENGERS—USE OF RAILROAD GROUNDS—CONTRACT—*B. & A. R. R. Co. v. BROWN*, 58 N. E. 189 (Mass.).—In this case the Massachusetts rule adopted in *Railroad Co. v. Tripp*, 147 Mass. 35, 17 N. E. 89, is followed. This rule is that a railroad company may give a hackman the exclusive right to solicit passengers upon its premises. *Railroad Co. v. Tripp* has been followed in *Godbont v. St. Paul Union Depot Co.*, 81 N. W. 835 (Minn.). But, aside from these two cases, the authorities are unanimous to the effect that no exclusive privilege can be given. *State v. Reed*, 76 Miss. 211; *McConnell v. Pedigo & Hayes*, 92 Ky. 465; *Railroad Co. v. Langlois*, 9 Mont. 419; *Cravens v. Rogers*, 101 Mo. 247; *Hack & Bus Co. v. Sootsina*, 84 Mich. 194; *Hedding v. Gallagher et al*, 69 N. H. 650, 46 Atl. 96, 9 *YALE LAW JOURNAL* 231. The principle deciding